

**MINUTES**  
**CITY OF RIVERSIDE**  
**CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**GENERAL PLAN 2025 PROGRAM - PUBLIC HEARING**



6:00 p.m. April 28, 2005  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL  
3900 MAIN STREET

**MINUTES APPROVED AS SUBMITTED AT  
THE JUNE 9, 2005 MEETING**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Brown, Densmore, Kurani, Leonard, Norton, Singletary, Stephens

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Agnew, Comer

STAFF PRESENT: Gutierrez, Planning Director  
Aaron, Principal Planner  
Jenkins, Senior Planner  
Milosevic, Associate Planner  
Brenes, Associate Planner  
Smith, Deputy City Attorney  
Andrade, Stenographer

**THE FOLLOWING BUSINESS WAS CONDUCTED:**

Chair Leonard called the meeting to order.

The Pledge of Allegiance was given to the Flag.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.	<b><u>PUBLIC HEARING - 6:00 p.m.</u></b> .....	<a href="#"><u>3</u></a>
1	<b><u>PLANNING CASE P04-0178:</u></b> Planning Commission review of the General Plan 2025 Program and related Final Program Environmental Impact Report (SCH NO. 2004021108). The General Plan 2025 Program consists of the following components: 1) the City of Riverside General Plan 2025; 2) the comprehensive revision of the City of Riverside Zoning Code (Title 19 of the Municipal Code) and the rezoning of properties to reflect new zone names; 3) the comprehensive revision of the City of Riverside Subdivision Code (Title 18 of the Municipal Code); 4) the Citywide Design Guidelines; and 5) the Implementation Plan. ....	<a href="#"><u>3</u></a>
B.	<b><u>ADJOURNMENT</u></b> .....	<a href="#"><u>14</u></a>
	Adjournment to the May 5, 2005 at 9:00 a.m. in the Art Pick Council Chambers. ....	<a href="#"><u>14</u></a>

A. **PUBLIC HEARING - 6:00 p.m.**

- 1 **PLANNING CASE P04-0178:** Planning Commission review of the General Plan 2025 Program and related Final Program Environmental Impact Report (SCH NO. 2004021108). The General Plan 2025 Program consists of the following components: 1) the City of Riverside General Plan 2025; 2) the comprehensive revision of the City of Riverside Zoning Code (Title 19 of the Municipal Code) and the rezoning of properties to reflect new zone names; 3) the comprehensive revision of the City of Riverside Subdivision Code (Title 18 of the Municipal Code); 4) the Citywide Design Guidelines; and 5) the Implementation Plan.

Chair Leonard welcomed everyone. He announced that the hearing would begin with a staff presentation. There are several topics tonight, the most central of the topics will be the discussion of the Mixed Use Zones. The Commission will also receive information and follow-up to questions the Commission had from the previous session.

Laura Stetson, consultant, stated she would pick up where they left off on the Zoning Code at last weeks meeting and continue with through Subdivision and Citywide Guidelines.

She stated staff had put together responses to the questions on the Industrial Zones that were raised at the April 21, meeting. There is a Zoning map which staff has provided this evening which shows the cluster of Industrial Zones in the community. She addressed the question as to why the City has proposed to consolidate the Industrial Zones at this point in time. There were four main reasons: the first is to focus on the Zoning Code to simplify the Code. To look at where Riverside is today and make sure that the Zones are structured to reflect where Riverside is headed based upon the General Plan Land Use policies. Second reason; to create standards for industrial development. There are currently no standards for setbacks as well as a couple of other things, for example, in the M-2 Zone. The focus was to make it clear what the City's goals are in terms of the development of new sites where industrial development will occur and if any current industrial sites are looking for expansion, that there are specific standards with regard to parking, setbacks, etc. The third and fourth reasons are probably the most important, the third being to encourage job and revenue growth in the City. It has been noted throughout this General Plan program that Riverside has few industrial properties left. These are areas where the City has the opportunity to create job growth and make sure there are appropriate uses designated for those areas that encourage job growth. The last reason is to enhance public safety. In the proposed former M-2 Zone, there were a number of uses that really could be perceived as public health safety risks due to the type of operation and proximity to residential neighborhoods. As an example of things currently permitted in the M-2 Zone that the City is looking to eliminate through this process, some may sound odd because the Zoning Code does date back in time, but poultry and rabbit killing, tire retreading, recapping, battery manufacture, plants, things that have noxious chemical uses associated that with them and create environmental and public health and safety hazards. Some of these uses no longer exist in Riverside and the City, consistent with its vision for industrial development, are no longer appropriate.

Commissioner Densmore commented that Ms. Stetson was failing to touch on a couple of issues. The overriding theme he has heard from the public and certain questions the Commission has posed is was there ever consideration of amnesty? There are, in fact, changes to the property where people who are now conforming would become nonconforming. Everyone has been told that nonconforming will go with the property, they have also been told realistically that there are some differences between having a legal right and a nonconforming right in order to obtain loans, sell a property or expand a property. Was "amnesty" considered so that a property that had certain rights would continue to have those rights, if for no other reason than they are there and legal?

Ms. Stetson replied that it was considered in a broad sense. The discussion has been considered and is not being brought forward for consideration at this point in time. This is something the Commission could discuss amongst themselves and make a recommendation, if they feel amnesty is appropriate for all uses that are currently permitted, based on investment or other reasons.

Commissioner Densmore stated that he thought it was unfair to expect the public or Commission to absorb and to be able to rationally make a decision with the volumes of material they have been handed. Perhaps the system does work because they are obviously picking up on some issues. He is gradually coming to a principle that when deliberations start, without tipping his hand, that first do no harm. If there is a direction the City wants to go into a particular area such as Jurupa, that is fine. If someone has been allowed to start a business in a particular area, it is beyond him why a particular zoning change would be allowed to happen if it would harm that particular individual or company. To say that it has been considered but it is up to Commission, the public or Council to catch it, he was having a great deal of difficulty with that. He was going back through his notes and those of the particular businesses. He is not key enough to know that there may be a business that has been a thorn in the side to the City for years, that doesn't come out in testimony. What he is kin to is what he hears in testimony. He reiterated that this was a major concern of his and a question that will continue to come up from time to time.

Commissioner Kurani stated that this was also his concern.

Ms. Stetson replied that Commissioner Densmore's comments is an issue that spans the entire Code and should be addressed as part of tonight's discussion.

She stated she would continue with the presentation on Article V and address Mixed Use Zones.

Chair Leonard stated that it was his understanding that these Mixed Use Zones were General Plan designations and that the existing Zones would remain. It would require the property owner to apply for rezoning in order to take advantage of the Mixed Use designations, it will not automatically be changed. He asked how minimum lot sizes were established.

Ms. Stetson replied affirmatively. She explained that they arrived at these by looking at what is in the areas today, particularly for the Mixed Use Neighborhood. Staff wanted to ensure that it responds and reflects what is on the ground today. It is really encouraging a continuation of those types of uses. She said that for the Village and Urban designations, staff took a look at other Mixed Use Ordinances. These were based empirically as to what is happening in the market, based on observation and reviewing other Codes.

Chair Leonard spoke regarding the private and common open space. He asked staff how projects would integrate common open space in vertical mixed use buildings with a store front on first level and living on the second floor. Would there be a provision when reviewing the site plan to evaluate recreation facilities in the immediate area that would be available to the project and use that as meeting their common open space requirements?

Ms. Stetson said that these projects would somehow integrate a common plaza, some type of open space on the site that could be used and enjoyed by all of the people in the development. With regard to the open space requirements, she would not interpret what is written in that way. She felt implicitly, certainly looking at what is in the area, but that she could not say that a public park could meet those common open space standards for a developer.

Craig Aaron, Principal Planner, stated that he agreed with Ms. Stetson, one thing the Commission should consider is that there is still the variance process. This is something that could be considered as part of the variance process for a particular development.

Ms. Stetson continued with an overview of the Overlay Zones.

Commissioner Brown asked why the Airport Protection Overlay Zone addressed hazardous zones but not noise.

Ms. Stetson explained that noise was addressed through the General Plan Noise Element. It is really a noise/land use compatibility concern. The Airport Protection Overlay is in response to land use plans for airports that are within crash zones.

Diane Jenkins, Senior Planner, added that the Airport Protection Overlay is envisioned to apply to airport influence areas of RMA, Riverside Municipal Airport, Flabob Airport and eventually March JPA as soon as the JLUS Study is completed and they have the new compatibility plan implemented. The influence area includes everything from crash and noise. It is all included in the plan which is how the Influence Area is developed and staff has applied that outside boundary to the Airport Protection Overlay Zone so that it is all built in.

Commissioner Brown said that this was precisely why he was asking the question. If addressing acute it includes noise and he didn't know why it wouldn't apply to all the airports in the Overlay Zones.

Mr. Aaron noted that there are different AP Overlay Districts depending on the severity of risk factors.

Chair Leonard noted that the Overlay Zones of the airports, other than March are reflected in the exhibits of the proposed General Plan. He did not want any surprises. He wanted to make sure that in adopting General Plan and Zoning Code, everyone will know what the requirements are on their property, exclusive of March.

Ms. Jenkins informed the Commission that the Airport Protection Overlay Zone would be applied at a separate hearing, it is not a part of this process. The Overlay is being created now but a zoning case will be initiated to apply it to the properties through a separate public hearing process.

Commissioner Stephens stated that Riverside was one of the few cities that actually collaborated with Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission to develop their Plan. These plans are on line at RCALUC.org. It has the Riverside Comprehensive Land Use Plan which shows the same six categories that the City will be adopting in its General Plan update.

Commissioner Densmore asked since some of these Overlay Zones are new, are there instances where the imposition of the Overlay Zone will affect the use of the property? How would the property owner be made aware of these new restrictions?

Ms. Stetson stated that where the Overlay Zones are proposed to be applied, the property owner would be subject to the new regulations in the Zoning Code.

Ms. Jenkins said that the Neighborhood Commercial Overlay is being applied to some properties in the City of Riverside and these properties have been notified.

Mr. Aaron wanted to reinforce that the Overlay Zones will always occur as part of a public hearing process and property owners will be notified.

Commissioner Densmore asked if any of those notifications were simply a notification of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance updates or whether they were specific notifications about the imposition/creation of an Overlay Zone in their area? Is it implied that they should attend because it involves something that may affect them or is the letter very specific?

Mr. Aaron replied that the letter is specific to each property.

Commissioner Densmore requested that the Commission be provided with exemplars of these notification letters going out to the public on anything that has to do with the General Plan and Zoning update. He would like a copy so that he can see the wording and have it for the Commission's deliberations.

Mr. Aaron agreed to provide these.

Commissioner Kurani said that the letters were specific because he did receive a couple of letters that applied to his property.

Ms. Stetson presented Article VII. This Article pulls together information that was scattered throughout the existing Code so that it is easy for people to find, to establish the standards and conditions for uses that require special attention due to the nature of the business. The reason for imposing these standards is to ensure that adverse impacts on surrounding properties are averted. Conditions apply to how the property is developed as well as how the property is used.

Chair Leonard noted that last week the Commission heard from a number of people operating contractor storage yards. Several individuals brought up the issue of screening. The Commission did not have an answer for them at that time but if you look under contractor storage yards, development standards, there it is.

Commissioner Brown asked for clarification. What staff is saying is that they now have all of the standards and policies compiled in one place, were any of the standards changed or was it just a transfer?

Ms. Stetson explained that some are new but that largely the effort was to bring forward what the City currently imposes. Some, for example, the contractors storage yard are consistent with the General Plan goals to ensure that there are standards to achieve the quality of development the City is looking for and achieve the neighborhood protection the City is looking for. If it was felt that there was a particular use that needed to have the standards augmented to achieve those goals, those types of changes were made. In terms of the specifics, she could not recall at this moment.

Commissioner Brown asked if the standards were noted somewhere as being new as opposed to bringing them forward for the benefit of the Commission as well as the public.

Mr. Aaron stated that they were not noted. Some of these were discussed at the workshops. As example there are quite a few uses that are not listed in the Code now and have been added, check cashing, bail bonds. These were added as uses and therefore standards were added.

Commissioner Densmore said there were some specific and very telling testimony at the last hearing regarding aesthetic standards in some of the areas. Could there be a legal use in a particular area right now which would have an aesthetic imposition or duty imposed on them as a result of what the Commission is deliberating on.

Ms. Stetson stated that if the use was legally established, they would become a legal nonconforming use and would not be forced to comply with the new provisions put in place.

Mr. Aaron noted that the nonconforming section applies to more than just uses, it applies to buildings and standards.

Commissioner Brown noted that there was someone who testified about protecting her property with barbed wire, will this person have to remove the barbed wire?

Mr. Aaron explained that this was a tricky question. Constertina wire is not permitted anywhere, it wasn't permitted 20 years ago and it is not permitted now. It is not a legally established fence, regardless if the business or building were legally established, if they added constertina wire, it is not legal.

Chair Leonard noted that several operating contractor storage yards last week indicated that the Ordinance would preclude them from any outdoor work, particularly on vehicles. Nothing in the contractors storage yard has a restriction about outdoor activities, he asked if it was listed somewhere else.

Ms. Stetson explained that the provisions of Article VII are additive to the underlying Zone. If the Zones states that outdoor welding is not permitted then it is not permitted, even if it is a contractors storage yard. She stated that in addition to the requirements of the underlying Zone this particular use has additional standards on top of it. She stated that perhaps language in each of the purposes could be added to make it clear.

Mr. Aaron said that this was not a bad idea and that perhaps an introductory paragraph should be added to this section that explains this issue.

Ms. Stetson introduced Article VIII.

Chair Leonard referred to the density bonus and regulations for new residential construction. This focuses on affordable and low income households. His question was whether there were provisions here or anywhere else that relates the quality of the appearance to qualifying for these bonuses.

Ms. Stetson answered that State Law requires a City to allow density bonuses for affordable housing. The City must grant density bonuses under very specific circumstances, not tied to design quality, however, the City does have a design review process. A density bonus cannot be denied based solely on design issues. If they are meeting the State law requirements, the City is obligated to grant that density bonus but certainly the City could work with the developer to get the design as part of the project.

She continued with presentation on Article IX, Administration of the Zoning Code.

Chair Leonard referred to page IX-47, items to be included in a site plan. He felt that a fencing plan should also be listed, this is a critical part to plan reviews. There is also a provision about modification of existing permits, page IX-23. Typically there is language indicating a distinction of changes that would be done at staff level versus a public hearing and he did not see this language included.

Ms. Stetson said that he was referring to was a threshold that she has seen in other Ordinances. She said she would note this to be addressed.

Chair Leonard also referred to IX-53, regarding the RC Zone and benchmarks for natural open space. There was testimony given regarding the fact that there is no minimum standard. He asked if staff has been able to look at this and arrive at a remedy that everyone can agree with.

Ms. Stetson asked to hold off on this question as she hadn't touched on the PRDs. She continued with the presentation to the site plan reviews.

She began her presentation of the Planned Residential Developments, PRDS. She stated that these only apply to the RE, RC, RR and all of the R-1 Zones. She read from the Code as to why PRDs are established or re-established in their new form which is to allow for flexibility and creativity in the design of single family residential development and for the application of the unique development standards that reflect special property conditions. The reason it has been recrafted in this manner, largely to avoid the need for multiple variances, it responds to unique conditions on a project site.

Chair Leonard stated that his understanding was that the use of variances is to minimize the mundaneness of using a variance, not for the instances where it encroaches into areas where there is a public interest for open space. This is a controversial area where he feels variance findings would have to be made and supported.

Ms. Stetson agreed.

Commissioner Kurani questioned the PRDs in the RA-5 Zone as in the La Sierra area.

Kristi Smith, Deputy City Attorney, clarified that the table provided to the Commission showed a PRDs in Rancho La Sierra but stated that this is being removed because there is no PRD in Rancho La Sierra area and it is not permitted. She stated that any development in the Rancho La Sierra area would be pursuant to a Specific Plan.

Commissioner Kurani asked whether the specific minimum requirements for the PRDs would be included.

Ms. Stetson stated that at the time the draft Code was released for public review, the provisions were not included. Staff has heard loud and clear from the Commission on a number of occasions that they would like to see something in that regard.

Commissioner Kurani stated that he would like to see specific direction in which they can determine what they can allow as minimum requirements.

Mr. Aaron agreed that the specific provisions for the smaller lot PRDs, R-1's particularly, should be added. He stated that this would not apply to the RC Zone, it would be counterproductive to those areas because the idea there is to create natural open areas. He noted that in the RC Zone there is still a minimum half acre lot size and common recreational facilities would not be needed.

Commissioner Brown said that during the formative days of the General Plan, there was a lengthy discussion regarding bridle paths. The Bradley / Woodcrest and La Sierra areas were discussed specifically. It was agreed unanimously that there was a need for these type of things. The need or cooperation was also recognized between the County and City as well as within the City's Sphere of Influence to tie these things together. He asked if it was in this Article where the teeth needed to be placed on this.

Ms. Stetson stated that this would be a site development issue that would be appropriately addressed in the Subdivision Code because it deals with land dedications at the time of land design, not a zoning issue.



Chair Leonard stated he did have this tagged as a topic to bring up under the Subdivision Ordinance.

Ms. Stetson continued with the presentation.

Chair Leonard proposed to go through the Subdivision Ordinance and take public testimony, and as time permits, continue with a presentation on the Design Guidelines.

Ms. Stetson presented the Subdivision Ordinance. She stated that the revisions were not only technical in nature but mainly a clean up effort. The Subdivision Code had not been updated in some time and there had been changes in State Law. The focus was on making sure that the Subdivision Code reflected the changes in State Law. There were a couple of procedural changes which she reviewed.

Commissioner Stephens inquired whether the City would accept maintenance for the off-set sidewalks in smaller projects.

Mr. Aaron replied that no, for standard subdivisions it would be the property owner's responsibility. In the case of smaller lot PRDs the homeowner's association would typically take care of these.

Commissioner Stephens stated that in the smaller subdivisions, often times the property owners do not take care of it.

Chair Leonard asked if this would apply to sections such as the Magnolia Center where the store front design concept is celebrated, this is only for suburban residential design.

Ms. Stetson stated that the focus was subdivision design.

Chair Leonard noted that this was lacking in terms of trail standards, including the fact that there should be cross sections to provide a visual reference. This should also apply to the streets, it would be helpful in terms of a one stop service.

Commissioner Densmore asked whether planners generally see the City Planning Commission as an extension of the residents or City Council. He stated that what he is sensitive to are instances where the Planning Commission is taken out of the picture, whether for developmental, time or stream lining processes. There was a reason why commissions and regulatory bodies were created and he wanted to make sure this is streamlining in a way that meets the intent of why boards like theirs were set up.

Ms. Stetson stated that a planning commission is viewed as a good public process to deal with issues important to the community and to make sure that the community's voice is heard in a public forum for those issues that require that type of a hearing. She pointed out that all decisions, at any level, are always appealable to the next level up.

Commissioner Densmore commented that streamlining a system so that something does not have to come before the Planning Commission is removing one voice.

Chair Leonard said that the distinction needed to be made where there are instances that trails can replace sidewalks or need to be in conjunction with them. He referred to page 3-20, tentative environmental subdivision map and methods to streamline the map in which the purpose is to convey acreage for environmental conservation. He has brought this up before but would like to at least obtain a definitive no in terms of whether there could be a financing mechanism. This is often used for commercial developments

for instances where parcels need to be subdivided for purposes of leasing, that do not have capital improvements attached to them. With regard to 4-39, contents of a tentative map talks about shielding existing building. He would like to see a reference that those maps indicate whether the structures will be demolished or remain. Also it would seem that in these provisions, that there is certain additional information needed for maps in the RC Zone that are unique to this Zone. On page 5-60, there is a reference to a cul-de-sac not having more than 16 lots and from a universal standpoint, are these looked at the same in terms of 16 R-1 or 16 Estate lots. There are strong differences between the length of a cul-de-sac in how those 16 lots are arrived at. He wanted to know if there was a distinction between the zones and number of lots.

Ms. Stetson stated that there is a maximum distance of a cul-de-sac in addition to the number of lots that can be on the cul-de-sac.

Chair Leonard noted that page 5-62, private street standards, which references a 20' paved width, he recalled that they have been using 24'. He also referred to page 5-63, private driveway standards, which include a number of provisions in wording.

Commissioner Brown thanked Chair Leonard for his support regarding the bridle trails. He felt that the Commission should make a special issue of this. He wants to make sure there is continuity in the trails for the areas horses are prevalent in right now. He would like to review this before the final draft is approved.

Mr. Aaron stated that there is a Trails Master Plan which does have some of the standards. When it is put into a Code, there are certain disadvantages sometimes but if it is the Commission's preference, staff would include this.

Chair Leonard noted that the Plan is there but there isn't an implementing tool.

Ms. Stetson said that there is a two step approach to this. The first in the Subdivision Code, it needs to be clear with regard to the dedication that is required as part of the mapping process. With regard to the cross sections, and this may be addressed in the same way that streets are addressed, that it is in a City's standards book not the Code.

Mr. Aaron added that the City does have standards, guidelines and handouts for private/public streets. The Park and Recreation Department has standards for trails in the Trails Master Plan. If you put it in an Ordinance there is sometimes less flexibility. If the Commission wants this to have more teeth overall, he would include this in the Ordinance.

*The Commission took a five minute break.*

Chair Leonard opened the public hearing for public testimony.

Steven Hilmer stated he owned commercial property at 3714 Sunnyside Drive. They area currently Zoned C-3 and are proposed to be MUV. He can see that they are really talking about three general things: General Plan, Zoning Code and the Implementation of the Zoning Code. During the previous discussions he has heard great concern about what the new Zone will mean to them. In his own instance, he is advised that his particular area would be allowed to be zoned Mixed Use Village but would retain its current zoning until someone applied for a change. His question was when does the Zoning change on each of the types of property.

Mr. Aaron explained that property owners have been notified where the Zones will be changed such as the Overlay and Industrial Zones. There will be an Ordinance that will be adopted by the City Council as part of

their final approval. Other designations such as the Mixed Use, have a land use designation that is being applied. The Zone change for these properties would happen later if the property owner requests this. The City will not rezone those properties.

Mr. Hilmer suggested that a list of the Zones that will be changed imminently and those that will be changed at the request of the property owner some time in the future would be helpful.

Ms. Jenkins stated that a General Plan Program newsletters has been produced and available at all the public hearings. The newsletter includes a listing of the Zones which explains the changes.

Mr. Hilmer stated he received one of those first 6,000 letters. He interpreted this letter to mean he was being changed but after listening to the presentation, he understands this is a false impression. He inquired whether the trails would be subject to an Overlay.

Chair Leonard replied no the trails would not be subject to an Overlay.

David Ball said he was a partner with the real estate firm, CT Realty. They own a number of properties in Riverside. They are in a purchase agreement to purchase properties, 10431 - 10491 Magnolia Avenue, and with them tonight is the owner of the properties. With regard to this property, they are requesting that the Mixed Use Village Zone be applied to the property. He pointed out that the property is such that it is 4 times deeper than it is in width and is currently zoned C-2. The Mixed Use Village designation comes up to their west border and they are asking that it be extended across their property. It is their intent to develop the property into three uses: residential, retail and restaurant. These properties will be integrated and pulled together through a site plan using the concepts outlined in the Mixed Use Village designation. He asked the Commission to support their efforts.

Mr. Aaron added that staff is in support of this proposal. The property owner's letter is on record.

Chair Leonard noted that there have been several letters that have been received requesting different changes in mixed use. He asked if staff would be addressing all of the letters in terms of staff's support.

Mr. Aaron indicated that in terms of individual property requests, staff is making a series of recommendations to the Commission. There is a whole stack of letters the Commission has received but staff will not be addressing each letter. Staff has taken the letters that staff believes merit the Commission's consideration for approval in changes to the current proposal. If the Commission wants to consider the remainder of the letters, they are part of the information provided along with the testimony and the Commission can make a recommendation on those.

Commissioner Brown stated he was not suggesting anything. His question was how staff intended to handle these things and wanted to make sure it followed a standard procedure.

Mr. Aaron explained that the standard procedure is that where staff supports the request, a recommendation for change is being submitted.

Commissioner Norton added that if the Commission believes something from the list should be added, they can bring it forward to the deliberations.

Commissioner Densmore stated that from his perspective, if someone took the time to testify or write a letter, it needs to be addressed.

Kimberly Sparkman, 5958 Jasmine, pointed out that there is no where in the Code that prohibits barbed wire or razor wire. Staff says that it is implied but it is nowhere in the Code. She expressed her concern that the land use provisions were discussed in the workshops but noted that there are hundreds of little changes. She noted that in the vehicle repair facilities which affects her, there are 10 changes. She was afraid that the public is not aware of the changes. She liked the idea of amnesty that was brought up for the existing businesses. Many businesses will become nonconforming in the Jurupa area if these changes are approved.

Commissioner Norton noted that Ms. Sparkman obviously had a particular focus and has done a good job of putting together items. She asked if she could provide these to the Commission.

Ms. Sparkman replied that she would provide the information.

Commissioner Stephens stated that if something exists today it does not mean it is legal. The issue regarding razor wire is something that will not be resolved today.

Nancy Maich, First Five Riverside, 2002 Iowa Avenue, addressed the Commission. She is the Special Projects Coordinator for First Five Riverside, also known as the Riverside County Children and Families Commission. As a representative of the Zoning and Land Use Committee for the Affordable Buildings for Children's Development (ABCD) Facilities Blueprint Task Force, she encouraged the City of Riverside to establish clear policy level support for adequate quality childcare as part of the General Plan. Currently, of the 58 Counties in the State of California, Riverside County ranks 58 in the supply of childcare. Given the fact that this is the fastest growing County in the State, this is a critical issue. She urged the Planning Commission to plan for childcare in the future of the City. Childcare not only impacts quality of life but the specific vitality of the local economy as well. Childcare facilities can serve as strong anchors to the communities and can strengthen neighborhoods. On behalf of First Five Riverside and Riverside County Childcare Consortium, she asked the Planning Commission to include childcare language in the General Plan, specifically to revise the Zoning Ordinance and CUP process for childcare centers to be clear simple and cost effective. She commended staff for the work done on the Family Home Childcare, they will be using this as a model for other cities.

Commissioner Densmore asked if Ms. Maich had model language that could be provided to Commission so that they would be sure to include all of their points.

Ms. Maich agreed and stated that they have been working with staff and have provided some information already.

Mr. Aaron stated that he would support Ms. Maich's suggestion and stated it could be added as part of the Implementation Plan as part of Article VII.

Ms. Jenkins announced that it was a measure that was already included as part of the Implementation Plan.

Rosalina Grisco stated she owned a boarding kennel at 5930 Jasmine Street. She agreed that rezoning her M-1 business to I was better than BMP. She disagreed with the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) attached to this Zoning. She and her husband plan to retire in a couple of years if a CUP is attached to their property it will be difficult to sell, lower their property value and impossible to expand.

Robert Treen stated that he represented Grace Baptist at 8223 California Avenue. He wrote a letter to the Planning Department requesting that this site be Zoned Mixed Use Village so that the property would have better use other than a church and preschool. He stated that the best use for that particular corner would be Mixed Use Village.

Chair Leonard referred to Mr. Treen's letter and asked why he would prefer Mixed Use Village over Mixed Use Neighborhood.

Mr. Treen stated that the Mixed Use Village would provide more flexibility to the buyer.

Arlee Montalvo, 4477 Picacho Drive, said her take on a lot of what is going on with the General Plan is that staff is trying to get it to be consistent. One of the things that has bothered her with the current General Plan which has transferred over to the new General Plan is the land use designation for hillside residential which has the RC Zone. The maximum dwellings per acre is .5 dwellings per acre, .63 for PRDs. She stated that Proposition R and Measure C very specifically explain that the size of the lot depends on the slope at its location. It also states that there can be no more than 1 house per 2 acres on average for a subdivided parcel, it does not guarantee 1 per 2 acres on average. She asked for some clarification on this issue.

Mr. Aaron stated that there were many issues addressed by Ms. Montalvo and there isn't just a single answer. He explained that there is simply a disagreement as to how the RC Zone is implemented. He stated that staff felt the proposal is consistent with Prop. R and Measure C.

Chair Leonard noted that this was the reason he brought up earlier the need for more information on tentative maps when they are in the RC Zone.

Ms. Montalvo stated that she very much disagreed. This is a continual problem. She has never heard the logic behind this and would like to see it written out in a logical way so that the people can understand it.

Yolanda Garland, resident of La Sierra, stated that it isn't pleasant to listen to the continued opposition to the changes being proposed. She felt this should be between the citizens and the City Council not the Commission. She felt that so far they have not heard one change that would benefit the residents. She announced that a conference will be held at the Marriott Hotel on April 30, 8:30 am - 5:00 pm on Redevelopment Abuse sponsored by the Municipal Officials for Redevelopment Reform and Californians United for Redevelopment Education. There will also be a community meeting, Thursday, May 5 at the Korean Baptist Church, 5413 Tyler Street at 7:00 pm sponsored by the Rural Residents and Horse Owners of Riverside titled La Sierra and Arlanza Under Attack. A fund raiser yard sale will also be held May 13 - 14 at 10944 Cypress. She stated that for more information they could log on to [talkriverside.com](http://talkriverside.com).

Mary Humbolt, 7407 Dufferin, commented that she has read articles dated 20 years ago regarding trails in Riverside. She noted that it has never happened and obviously, someone doesn't want them. She has heard that a Trails Coordinator was supposed to have been hired a year ago but nothing has happened. Somewhere, somebody has to stand up tall and she appealed to the Commission to do this. She stated that she has toured the two kennels. For those that need to stash their dogs somewhere on weekends or for trips, these are great kennels. This would be a great loss to the City if they don't have them anymore. She also did not want to be one of those cities that needs to go somewhere else to repair their vehicles. She urged the Commission to listen to the small business owners and pay attention to what they are saying.

Ms. Sparkman pointed out that all auto repair shops will now require a CUP where before it was not required.

Commissioner Norton asked whether it was auto repair or auto repair with outside service?

Mr. Aaron deferred to Ms. Jenkins. He pointed out that staff is not saying that they are not permitted, just that they need a use permit to ensure that they are compatible with the neighboring uses.

Ms. Jenkins read the requirements for auto repair. She noted that minor auto repair require CUPs now in the Commercial Zones and will continue to do so in those Zones.

Commissioner Densmore said that if the planner in charge has to continue to refer to the charts, it is obvious the Commission and public will be confused too. He wanted to be clear on this and asked if he is a legal auto repair shop where the Zoning is proposed to be changed to BMP or I, would he need a CUP to continue?

Ms. Jenkins responded that this would be a legal nonconforming use in the BMP Zone and would need a minor conditional use permit to expand in the I Zone.

Commissioner Densmore asked if there are any instances where a legal auto repair shop, as a result of the Zone change would need to apply for a minor or full CUP.

Ms. Jenkins stated that if it was a legal use and were making no changes, they would not need to apply.

Ms. Sparkman pointed out that the business would be nonconforming. She understood that she would not have to apply for a CUP. Her main concern is the nonconforming status.

Ms. Montalvo asked again what the rationale was, why wasn't an Overlay or Zone added where these types of businesses are permitted. This is an important part of the citizen's lifestyle and economy.

Chair Leonard reminded everyone that these are recommendations. The Commission will be deliberating this in the near future. The Commission will consider the testimony, nothing is decided at this point.

He announced that due to the hour, the Design Guidelines will be carried over to the next meeting. It is anticipated that the Commission will begin deliberations on May 19, 2005.

B. **ADJOURNMENT**

Adjournment to the May 5, 2005 at 9:00 a.m. in the Art Pick Council Chambers.